IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY NINETH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 19880 of 2004

Between:

B.Anjaneyulu S/o.B.Anjaiah
Chilakaluripet, Guntur District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 A.P.S.R.T.C. rep by its Managting Director Musheerabad Depot, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
2 The Executive Director, APSRTC Vijayawada Zone at Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, more particularly one in the nature writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents intentionally withholding the interview call letter to the petitioner in letter No.E2/255 (05)/97-ED(VJA) Dt.26.5.1997 as illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner duly fixing the seniority with reference to letter dt.26.5.1997 and pass such other order or orders as the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.K.VENUGOPAL REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.B.VINAYAKA SWAMY

The Court at the stage of admission, made the following :

-

-

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner's grievance is that though he is eligible for the post of Assistant Manager (Traffic), he is not being considered since 1997. He further represents that on 02-11-2004 again candidates who are juniors to him and persons who are not in the "seniority list" are also called for the interview for the said post without sending him any call letter. Therefore, he approached this Court seeking to declare that the action of the respondents in withholding the interview call letter to the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner duly fixing his seniority with reference to the letter dated 26-05-1997. It is not known as to why the petitioner's name was not considered to call him for interview. The petitioner's counsel represented that if the matter is posted for counter of the respondents, the interviews proposed to be conducted on 02-11-2004 would be over.

In the light of the circumstances explained by the petitioner, he is directed to make a representation to the 1st respondent and on receipt of such representation, the 1st respondent is directed to examine the case of the petitioner, and, if he is found eligible he may be permitted to attend the interview by intimating the petitioner.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____ Dr.G.YETHIRAJULU, J.

Dated: 29th October, 2004.

NOTE:

Issue C.C. today

(B/O)

***TSNR**

TO

1. The Managting Director,A.P.S.R.T.C., Musheerabad Depot, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
2 The Executive Director, APSRTC Vijayawada Zone at Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

3. Two C.D.Copies